THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY
3 1151 02671 0420

61551

Library

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY · BALTIMORE · 1876 ·

VERITAS VOS LIBERABIT

Johns Hopkins University
of the

Rec. Apr. 1/93
Accepted Ap. 30/93

The Struggle
of
Protestant Dissenters
for
Religious Toleration
in
Virginia.

By Henry R. McIlwaine

A Dissertation presented to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University for the Degree of Ph. D.

April 1893.

61551

Contents.

Page
Introduction — 1
Chapter I.—
The Established Church of Virginia — 4
Chapter II.— The Quakers — 37
Chapter III.—
The Huguenots and the Germans — 83
Chapter IV.— The Presbyterians — 95
Summary — 159
Bibliography — 165
Biographical Note — 170

Introduction.

The history of Protestant Dissenters in Virginia may be divided into three periods:—

I. The first period extends from the early years of the settlement of the Colony to the year 1649. This is the period of the establishment of the Church of England as the Church of Virginia; of the conflict that arose between the Church of England party and the Puritan party in Virginia, answering to the struggle between King Charles and his Parliament in England; and of the consequent withdrawal of many of the Puritans from Virginia into Maryland. The Church

of England was for a time triumphant.

The Puritans in Virginia and Maryland have been made the subject of special study by Dr. Daniel R. Randall. His monograph — A Puritan Colony in Maryland — is published in the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science for 1886.

II. The second period, beginning with the year 1649, extends to the close of the French and Indian War.

It embraces the rise of the Quakers, and later of the Presbyterians; and the efforts made by the Dissenters looking toward the recognition of their rights on the part of the government.

It may be called The Period of Struggle for Religious Toleration.

III. After the close of the French

and Indian War, comes the struggle of the Separate Baptists, the Revolutionary War, and the final triumph of the Dissenters over the Established Church in the "Act for the Establishment of Religious Freedom" of 1786. This period may be called the Period of Struggle for Religious Freedom.

The present paper is confined to a treatment of the second of the three periods described — the Period of Struggle for Religious Toleration.

I.

The Established Church of Virginia

At the time of the first settlement of Virginia, that great movement known as the Protestant Reformation had not achieved its perfect work. Only the first steps had been taken toward the religious freedom that prevails to-day. For the authority of the Church of Rome there had been substituted the authority of various Reformed Churches in the several Protestant countries of Europe; that authority was still absolute. That form of belief adopted by each state as the national religion must be conformed to by each member of the state, or per-

secution would follow. Thus in Virginia, settled in the main by conforming Englishmen, not for religious reasons but for the advancement of their temporal fortunes, naturally the Church of England was established by law.

In theory the Church of Virginia was simply a branch of the Church of England — simply a part of a greater whole. But in respect to forms of worship, and more especially in respect to church government, it developed such important differences that in its actual working it fell far short of true Episcopacy.

The following description of the Church of Virginia is drawn in the main from the "Present State of

Virginia," a work written in 1724 by the Reverend Hugh Jones. Other sources, however, have been drawn upon for occasional illustration and enlargement. The view is of the Church at the time of the administration of Sir Alexander Spotswood, governor of Virginia from 1710 to 1722, by which time the peculiarities of the Church had about reached their full development.

The different stages of this development, so far as it was under the control of the General Assembly of Virginia, may be seen in the various enactments of that body on religious questions.[1] These are extremely numerous, commencing with the earliest session of the Assembly, and continuing

1 Cf. Hening's Statutes at Large, I. pp. 123, 144, 149, 155, 180, 240, 268-9, 433, 532-3 &c.

at intervals throughout the entire history of the Colony. We are not, however, concerned here with the individual statutes, but with the results of the whole body of legislation, modified as they were by the power of the royal governors, and by the rather nominal power of the bishops of London, in whose diocese Virginia, as well as the other colonies, was embraced.

The bishop of London was represented in Virginia by a commissary, whose authority was, however, very limited. The office had not been created till the year 1689, when the Rev. James Blair was appointed.[1] But by that time the Church of Virginia had reached such a stage of development independently

[1] Hawks, "Contributions to the Ecc. Hist. of the United States of America", I. 73.

of a commissary that, where his power this power came into conflict with the established order of things, it was practically nullified. On the one hand, the commissary came into conflict with the governor, who claimed to represent, not only the king, but the bishop of London also. In this contest the governor, very naturally, proved the stronger. Nor, on the other hand, would the people submit to visitations. On this point Mr. Jones says, "Visitations have been in vain at Jamestown; for the corrupt abuses and rigor of ecclesiastical courts have so terrified the people, that they hate almost the very name, and seem more inclinable to be ruled by any other method, rather than the present spiritual courts"[1]. The people were evidently

[1] "Present State of Virginia", p. 66.

afraid that visitations would lead to some worse form of ecclesiastical interference. Thus the commissaryship soon sank into insignificance. Its holder was hardly more than a confidential correspondent of the bishop of London.

In a certain sense the governor was the head of the Church of Virginia, but his headship rested upon two widely discordant theories — the popular theory and the prerogative theory.

According to the first of these, the governor had been made head of the Church by the law of 1643[1], which was re-enacted in effect in 1662. This law provided, "That for the preservation of purity and unity of doctrine and discipline in the Church, and the right administration of the sacraments, no

[1] Beverley, "Hist. of Virginia", p. 212.

minister be admitted to officiate in this country, but such as shall produce to the governor a testimonial that he hath received his ordination from some bishop in England, and shall then subscribe to be conformable to the orders and constitution of the Church of England, and the laws there established; upon which the governor is hereby requested to induct the said minister into any parish that shall make presentation of him: and if any other person, pretending himself a minister, shall, contrary to this act, presume to teach or preach publicly or privately, the governor and Council are hereby desired and empowered to suspend and silence the person so offending; and upon his obstinate persistance, to compel him

to depart the country with the first convenience."[1] Under this law the vestries claimed the right of original presentation, leaving to the governor only the right of inducting the ministers who had been chosen by the vestries and presented for this ceremony.

But the governors had a theory of their own. Taking high prerogative

[1] Hawks, p. 53. Quoted from Trott's "Laws of the British Plantations", p. 116.

Hening (Vol. I. 277) does not give the full text of the law. He seems to have had in his possession only an abstract of it, which he construed so as to make the law inflict the penalty of expulsion on all Nonconformists, lay as well as clerical (I. p. XV). In this error he has been followed by later historians. It seems clear that the law applied to ministers only.

grounds, they claimed headship, and a more complete headship, by virtue of their commissions from the crown. This theory is clearly set forth in a letter written by Gov. Spotswood[1] in 1713 to the vestry of the Parish of St. Anne in Essex County. The following sentence occurs: "As the king is the sovereign of these plantations, so is he vested with the right of patronage of all ecclesiastical benefices, unless when it appears that he has by apt words granted the same away to private subjects." This right had at one time been "granted away" to Lords Arlington and Culpeper. In the grant by which they had been made proprietors of Virginia,

[1] Letter given in Meade's "Old Churches and Families of Virginia", II. Appendix.

it was expressly stated that they should be "sole and absolute patrons of all the churches and chapels - - - - - - - - - within the said territory". When this grant reverted to the crown, the right of patronage reverted with it; and this right had been "expressly excepted out of the bishop of London's patent as bishop of the Plantations". Governor Spotswood shows further that his commission and instructions from the crown expressly give him full power to collate to ecclesiastical benefices without consulting the vestries.

The English attorney-general, Sir Edward Northey, had in 1703 given it as his opinion that "the right of presentation by the laws of Virginia was in the parishioners, and the right of

lapse in the governor"[1]. Spotswood's claims went, as we have seen, much beyond this. In practice, however, he did not go so far as the law of Virginia undoubtedly allowed; for he never ventured to make use even of this power to induct in case of six month vacancies[2].

Briefly put, the question was whether or not the men who had established the living should be its patrons. The claim of the vestries was distinctly an American one, and its successful maintenance shows to what an extent the theory and practice of the Church of Virginia had departed from strict Anglican views. The vestries remained the true centre of power.

1 Campbell's "Hist. of Va.", 402. 2 Meade, I. 162.

The power of the vestries was derived not alone from the laws of the Colony, but even more largely from the peculiar constitution of Virginia society. The law of 1643, upon which the vestries based their claims to the right of presentation, has been given above. At the session of the General Assembly for 1661-62, the year after the restoration of Charles II., a thorough revision of the laws of the Colony was made. Act II. of this session, embracing and enlarging statutes that had been before enacted, placed vestries on their final legal basis. It is in part as follows; "That for the making and proportioning the levies and assessments for building and repairing the churches and chapels,

provisions for the poor, maintenance of the minister, and such other necessary duties for the more orderly managing all parochial affairs, Be it enacted that twelve of the most able men of each parish be by the major part of the said parish chosen to be vestrymen ---".[1]

Two churchwardens were to be chosen yearly out of their body by the vestry itself acting with the minister. A most important provision of the law was that the vestry itself should fill vacancies made in its own number by death or removal from the parish. By act XIII.[2] of the same session, churchwardens were required to make twice a year presentments in the county courts of such misdemeanors as in

[1] Hening, II. 44. [2] Ibid. II. 52.

their own knowledge, or by common fame, had been committed. These misdemeanors were swearing, abusing the sabbath, contemning God's Word or sacraments, absence from church, drunkenness, fornication, adultery, slandering and backbiting. The church-wardens were, in a word, guardians of the morals of the people. They were, in addition, agents of the vestries in keeping the churches in repair and furnishing them suitably, and in collecting and paying the salaries of the ministers.

A course of action that added greatly to the power of vestries was the plan adopted by them almost invariably of employing a minister for only a year at a time, and failing

to make presentation of him to the governor for induction. Very few ministers were ever regularly inducted. The plan was adopted as a measure of self-defence. In the bad condition of the clergy prevailing at that time, it was sought to prevent unacceptable ministers from being saddled upon the parishes.[1] This dependence, however, of ~~the~~ ministers for their position upon the good will of vestries was a feature in church government entirely at variance with the English system.

But the reason why the governors of the Colony were always careful to keep, as far as possible, on good terms with the vestries, is not to be found in the legal power of these bodies. It is to

[1] Meade, I. 150ff.

be sought, rather, in the respect that the governors had for the influence of the individuals who composed the vestries. The vestrymen were always the leading men of the community. In colonial days in Virginia, it was considered an honor to hold office, and office-holding tended ever to become the badge of a class. A member of the parish vestry was nearly always chosen to represent the county in the House of Burgesses. If not a vestryman, the member of the House was sure to be a representative of the same ruling class and jealous for its privileges.[1] The governors, then, in order to keep in

[1] In order to see to what an extent the membership of the House of Burgesses was made up of vestrymen, it

favor with the House of Burgesses, were compelled to use great discretion in their dealings with the vestries.

In addition to this, the vestrymen had in some cases been educated in England, and had such business and social connections there that they knew how to make the force of their resentment against the governor have weight with the English government. And it was

is only necessary to compare its lists of members given in Hening's "Statutes", with the vestry-rolls given in Meade's "Old Churches and Families of Virginia". Bishop Meade makes the statement that there were not three members of the Virginia Convention of 1776 who were not vestrymen of the Established Church. This illustrates how the power of the Colony was concentrated in the hands of a few men.

the general policy of the English government to allow the people of the Colony to have their own way where this did not affect seriously the amount of revenue to be extracted from them. In no manner is this better illustrated than in the removal of governors who made themselves obnoxious. Spotswood himself, the best of all the governors, and a man whom the Virginians seem to have respected highly, incurred the enmity of some; and means were found to have to have him displaced.[1]

For the foregoing reasons, the vestries were strong enough to make their claims good against the combined protests of the governor, the commissary, and the clergy. As a result, the Church

[1] Campbell, "Hist. of Va.", p. 404.

of Virginia, in the absence of central authority, was really a collection of independent congregations bound together rather in theory than in fact.

It was natural that from this state of affairs irregularities should arise in church services; and it causes no surprise to find the following sentences in Jones's "Present State of Virginia":—

"In several respects the clergy are obliged to omit or alter some minute parts of the liturgy, and deviate from the strict discipline and ceremonies of the Church; to avoid giving offence, through custom, or else to prevent absurdities and inconsistencies. Thus surplices, disused there for a long time in most churches, by bad

example, carelessness, and indulgence, are now beginning to be brought in fashion, not without difficulty; and in some parishes where the people have been used to receive the communion in their seats (a custom introduced for opportunity for such as are inclined to Presbytery to receive the sacrament sitting), it is not an easy matter to bring them to the Lord's table decently upon their knees".[1]

This passage casts a strong light upon the condition of affairs. It reveals the strength of local custom, and the strength of partial non-conformity within the Church itself.

For an understanding of the influences which had brought about this

[1] "Present State of Virginia" p. 67.

diversity of local custom, a glance must be taken at the different elements that composed the population of Virginia.

First, it should be remembered in this connection that up to the time of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, passed by the "Cavalier" Parliament of Charles II., the Church of England was not thoroughly an Episcopal church, in that it did not in all cases require Episcopal ordination of its ministers. The struggle between the Puritan[1] party and the Episcopal party had been going on largely within the Church itself, and with varying success. But by this act Presbyterian and other Puritan min-

[1] The term Puritan is intended to embrace all those who objected to bishops & the Book of Common Prayer.

ishers were forced from the Church to the number of about two thousand. This was about one-fifth the entire ministry of the Church at that time.[1] These facts warrant the statement that very many of the members of the English Church who settled in Virginia early in her history, were probably tinctured to a greater or less extent with Puritanism, in the broad sense of the term. These could not have failed to make their influence felt locally in church affairs.

The question of the strength of the more extreme Puritans (Independents) in Virginia is a much vexed one. Their number, however, must have been much greater than was formerly supposed. The Virginia Com-

[1] Green, "Hist. of the English People", III. 361.

pany of London was composed of some of the broadest minded men of the age; and certainly after 1619 Sir Edwin Sandys and other leaders of the party that advocated popular rights as opposed to the royal prerogative, had a preponderating influence in its councils. So much so, that the company became in the eyes of the king "but the seminary to a seditious Parliament", and in 1624 its charter was revoked. Such a body of men would hardly have been very strict in requiring of applicants for patents conformity to the Church of England at a time when the most energetic means were being employed to find colonists. And, on the other hand, it would have been the height of

folly for the settlers themselves, in the midst of struggles against primitive nature and hostile savages, to carry their religious antipathies to the extent of persecution. Papists, indeed, were excluded; for at that time it could not be understood how a Papist could be at heart a loyal Englishman, and the claims of Catholic Spain upon the territory of Virginia were not to be lost sight of.

But there is good reason to believe that there were Independents in the Colony as early as 1611. From time to time after that date small companies of them continued to come over from England, and these settled principally in Nansemond County, in the south-eastern section of the

colony. During the struggle between Charles I. and Parliament, they were strong enough to excite the alarm of the government of Virginia. The Nansemond congregations, encouraged by the state of affairs in England, sent in 1641 to New England for ministers. Three ministers answered the call. These were met by the law of 1643, requiring Episcopal ordination of the clergy; and two of the three were compelled to leave the colony[1]. However, the doctrines of Puritanism spread.

---

[1] The fact that the third minister remained, seems to indicate that he had received Episcopal ordination, and so could not be reached by the law.

Mr. Harrison, the governor's chaplain, became a convert, and went to preach to the people in Nansemond. Harrison reported afterwards that several members of the Council and about one thousand among the people were inclined to Puritanism. To what extent this number consisted of political Puritans is not indicated. Finally the government adopted such measures toward the Nansemond Independents as were calculated to deprive them of their leaders and check their growing importance[1]. Under these circumstances many of them emigrated to Mary-

[1] The nature of these measures is not known. The confused account given of the Nansemond congregation by John Hammond in his "Leah and

land, from the government of which colony their elder, Richard Bennett, had obtained for them substantial privileges. But many of them remained in Virginia. After the day-

Rachel" cannot be accepted as accurate: It is impossible to believe that Governor Berkeley, stout-hearted royalist that he was, would have dared to expel from Virginia, as Hammond states, the representatives of a party which at that time was triumphant in England.

Again, Hammond says that Colonel Samuel Mathews was the chief actor in the persecution of the Independents. This is the same Colonel Mathews who became in 1656 head of the Provisional Government of Virginia. Assuming that Hammond's account is correct, it would be almost impossible

of the Commonwealth, when the Church
of Virginia [illegible] again established
of England as an Episcopal establishment was again introduced into Virginia, those of the Nansemond Independents who remained, probably gave in a nominal conformity.

to explain the later influence of Col. Mathews with the Puritan party in the day of their power.

Also, the fact that Governor Berkeley remained in Virginia unmolested during the whole time of the ascendency of the Puritan party, seems to prove that his persecution of Independents could not have been extreme. It has been already shown that he had no warrant in law for severe measures against ordinary lay Nonconformists (p. 11, Note).

Hammond, it should be remembered, had been himself expelled from Virginia

But they must have been strong enough to affect the character of the parish, or parishes, in which they were located. Probable traces of their influence will be discussed further on in this paper.

---

for turbulence in 1652 by the Provisional Government, and had taken up his residence in Maryland. There he had taken the side of Governor Stone in the dissensions stirred up by the Puritans who had come from Virginia; and he was compelled to leave that colony also. His hatred of the Puritans was intense. In writing his account of the Nansemond congregation, it was undoubtedly his desire to make their conduct, in turning against the government that had received them in their adversity, appear as monstrous as possible. And in order to bring into

In regard to the Puritans who came to Virginia in the time of the Commonwealth or after the Restoration of Charles II., there is no reliable information. Beverley says that some came, but that their number was small[1]. Beverley, however was a strict churchman and of Royalist parentage; and on this account he would be inclined to depreciate the influence of settlers of the party opposed to his own. It is probable, however, that those of the party who came to Virginia at this time — certainly those who came after the restoration — were stronger relief the kindness that they experienced in Maryland, he exaggerates the story of their hardships in Virginia.

[1] History of Virginia, p. 232.

political, rather than religious, Puritans; for men of the latter class would have preferred New England. Hence it may be concluded that they found no scruples in giving their adhesion to the established Church. But the influence of such men would naturally be toward [illegible]ical freedom.

There must be added to these the Scotch merchants, of Presbyterian education, who were always numerous in Virginia[1].

Another element of the population of the Colony consisted of foreigners, that is, of men not from the British Islands. At a very early period there are traces of Germans, Poles, French, & Dutch.[2]

1. Campbell, p. 448

2 "Narrative and Critical Hist. of America", III. 132. Neill, "Virginia Company of London", pp. 227, 242, 285.

Later on came Walloons from time to time; and still later, Huguenots.[1]

The combined influence of these various elements would seem to be enough to account for the irregularities in forms of service noticed by the Rev. Mr. Jones.

This view of the Church of Virginia will enable us to understand the attitude of the Church as a whole toward Dissenters, and the attitude of its local units. The independence of these units should be kept in mind. In it is to be found an explanation of the unique manner in which laws against

---

1 "Huguenot Emigration to Virginia" (Virginia Historical Collections, V.), pp. X. & following.

To the settlement of the Huguenots at Manakin Town and of the Germans at Germanna a special chapter of this paper will be devoted.

Divisions were executed in different sections of the colony. Instances of this inequality will be given in the next chapter.

II.

The Quakers.

It is aimed in the present chapter and the following chapters to trace the conflicts that arose between the government of Virginia and the Protestant Dissenters who came into the Colony after 1649; and to discover the causes which resulted in the final recognition of the rights of the latter. A detailed account of the Dissenters will not be presented. Their story has been told in various works with more or less minuteness. Only so much of it will be given here as is necessary to an understanding of underlying principles.

During the time of the Provision-

al Government in Virginia, church affairs were left to the management of the vestries, no changes in service being insisted upon by the Parliamentary Commissioners except that, after one year from the signing of the Articles of Surrender, the Book of Common Prayer should not be used in public worship. No provision was made so as to bring the Church into agreement with the Church as it was at that time established in England.

About the year 1656 Quakers began to make their appearance in Virginia. Elizabeth Harris was their first missionary, and during her short stay she seems to have met with some success in making converts[1]. Josiah Cole and Thomas Thurston

[1] Janney, "History of the Religious Society of the Friends" etc., I. 430 and following
(See next page)

came over from England towards the close of the year 1657, and were probably imprisoned for a short time by the authorities. Thurston, it appears suffered imprisonment again the following year[1], as did also William Robinson[2].

Janney says that one of the converts of Elizabeth Harris was Robert Clarkson, a respectable and influential colonist of Severn, where there was a Friends' meeting as early as 1657. He gives the location of Severn as between the Rappahanock and York rivers in Virginia. This is evidently an error.

In a letter to Elizabeth Harris from Clarkson, dated from Severn, the 14th day of the Eleventh month, 1657, the following passage occurs:—

"The two messengers thou spoke of in thy letter, are not yet come to this place;

[1] Janney, I. 433. [2] Neill, "Virginia Carolorum", p. 285, note.

There was at this time no special law in Virginia against Quakers, and these imprisonments were made in accordance with the general English practice. Under Cromwell's government, notwithstanding Cromwell's own principles of toleration, there was

we heard of two come to Virginia in the fore part of the winter, but we hear that they were soon put into prison and not suffered to pass; we heard further that they desired liberty to pass to this place, but it was denied them" &c - - -

"We have disposed of most of the books which were sent, so that all parts are furnished, and everyone that desires it may have benefit of them; at Herring Creek, Roade River, South River, all about Severn, the Broad Neck and thereabouts, the seven mountains, and

still great harshness shown toward this sect in England.

During the period of the Provisional Government in Virginia, the governors of the Colony were elected by the General Assembly. In March, 1660, two months

Kent."

The first of these passages strongly indicates that the writer of the letter was not in Virginia. The names mentioned in the second passage are conclusive of the point. They are all to be met with in the general vicinity of Annapolis, Maryland. The Kent spoken of is Kent Island, which was the territory in dispute between Lord Baltimore and Col. William Claiborne. Severn, now appearing on the map as the name of the river on which Annapolis is situated, was at that time the name of a settlement made by the Puritans who had recently come from Virginia.

1 Cf. [illegible] I.

before the return of Charles II. to England, Sir William Berkeley was elected governor. This signalizes the return to power of the Royalist party in Virginia. One of the first acts of the Assembly, after the election of Berkeley, was directed against the Quakers.[1] It provided that no master or commander of a ship should, under penalty of £100 sterling, bring any Quaker into Virginia; and that all Quakers were to be apprehended and committed to prison without "baile or mainprize" till they should give security to leave the Colony. If any should dare to return, he was to be proceeded against as a contemner of the "laws and magistracy and punished accordingly"; and again banished. If any should return after this second expulsion

1 Hening, I. 532

he was to be proceeded against as a felon.

No person, under like penalty of £100, should entertain any Quaker that had been "questioned by the governor and council"; nor permit their assemblies in or near his house.

Distribution of Quaker literature was also forbidden.

There is no evidence that any Quaker ever suffered the extreme penalties of this harsh law. It is probable that the Declaration issued by Chas. II. from Breda had at least a temporary effect upon the authorities of Virginia.[1] And this Declaration embodied the principle

[1] The Declaration was issued April 14, 1660. Information of it must have very soon reached Virginia. Probably towards the close of the year, it was sent officially to Governor Berkeley (2 Virginia Carolorum, p. 231)

that no man should be called in question for differences of religious opinion, so long as he did not disturb the peace of the kingdom.

In 1662-1663 the laws of the Colony underwent a thorough revision. The new statutes against Quakers and other Dissenters, though still severe, were noticeably less harsh than the old. In an act of 1662 providing against the profanation of the sabbath by unnecessary work or by absence from church services, Quakers and "other recusants, who out of nonconformity totally absent themselves", are excepted from its general provisions and put into a special class. On them, for each month's absence a fine of £20 sterling was imposed. If absent a year, the offender was

to give security for his good behavior, and also pay the fines for the monthly absences[1]. Next comes the act of the same year imposing a fine of two thousand pounds of tobacco on anyone who refused to have his child baptized[2].
In the following year (1663), the act headed "An Act prohibiting the unlawful Assembling of Quakers" was passed. Other Nonconformists, however, were included with the Quakers by the preamble of their act; and from the preamble it may be also seen that the measure was in part political as well as religious[3]. The provisions of the act were:—

1. Quakers of the age of sixteen years or over, assembling together to the number of five or more, were, for the first offence, to be fined two hundred

[1] Hening II. 48. [2] Ibid. II. 165. [3] See bottom of next page.

pounds of tobacco; for the second, five hundred pounds of tobacco; and for the third, to suffer banishment.

2. If anyone should be unable to pay the fine so imposed, it was to be collected from one of the wealthier Quakers at the meeting.

The preamble is in part as follows:-

"Whereas it is evident ~~that~~ of late time that certain persons, under the names of Quakers and other names of separation, have taken up and maintained sundry dangerous opinions and tenets; and whereas the said persons under pretense of religious worship, do often assemble themselves in great numbers in several parts of this Colony, to the great endangering its public peace and safety, and to the terror of the people by strict correspondency among themselves" &c.

(Page 29 – Introduction to the note)

Though the accounts of the Canadian by Champlain are ... by various ... writers, ~~I ... of the ...~~ ~~disagreement~~ we have no [illegible] of the exact ... of each.

It seems, ~~[illegible]~~ however, that the ... account given of the affair by John Heckewelder in his "Indian Nations" cannot be accepted as accurate.

(Then continue the note as it is written on p. 30, "It is impossible" &c.

3. Masters of vessels who brought Quakers into the Colony, unless by virtue of a recent act of Parliament, were to be fined five thousand pounds of tobacco, and compelled to take them away on the return trip.

4. Persons entertaining Quakers in order for them to preach were to be fined five thousand pounds of tobacco for each offence.

5. Officers of the Colony who neglected to carry out the provisions of the law, should be fined two thousand pounds of tobacco.

6. It was provided, in conclusion, that Quakers or other Separatists who gave security to attend no meetings in the future, were to be released from the penalties of the law.[1]

[1] Hening, II. [illegible]

The number of Quakers who suffered under these laws cannot be determined. The records of the courts have in most cases been lost; and Quaker accounts of persecutions necessarily rest under the suspicion of being exaggerated. Nor do these accounts always distinguish between maltreatment by the populace and punishment inflicted by law. The whipping of Mary Tomkins and Alice Ambrose, for instance, as described in Bishop's "New England Judged"[1], if authentic, is to be explained probably as the work of a mob. There seems to have been no warrant in law for such a punishment.

[1] Account quoted in Neill's "Virginia Carolorum", p. [illegible].

In connection with the laws of the Colony there must be taken the instructions given by the ~~English government~~ crown to Sir William Berkeley on the 12th of September, 1662. With reference to religious differences these instructions were:—

"And because we are willing to give all possible encouragement to persons of different persuasion in matters of religion to transport themselves thither with their stocks; you are not to suffer any man to be molested, or disquieted in the exercise of his religion, so he be content with a quiet and peaceable enjoying it, not giving therein offence or scandal to the Government; but we oblige you in your own house and family to the profession of the

profession of the Protestant religion, according as it is now established in our Kingdom of England, and the recommending it to all others under your government, as far as it may consist with the peace and quiet of our said Colony."[1]

These instructions, which reveal the steady desire of the English government to foster the growth of the population of Virginia, could not have been entirely disregarded by Governor Berkeley. The growth of population, too, was greatly desired by the people. For this and for other reasons, which will be explained below, the people were not undivided in their support of persecuting measures against Quakers. The provisions of the law that were

1 Given in "Virginia Carolorum," p. 292

of the Colony who neglected to carry out its requirements should be fined two thousand pounds of tobacco, gives an intimation of the way in which it was in some localities soon to become almost a dead letter; for the spirit of the execution of the law depended upon local feeling.

The House of Burgesses, however, in the session of 1663, set the example of proceeding against Quakers. John Porter, a burgess from the County of Lower Norfolk, having been accused of being well-affected towards the Quakers, and so far "an Anna-baptist as to be against the baptizing of children", was, upon his refusal to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, dismissed from the House. But it is to.

be inferred from the order of the House dismissing Porter that the action was taken owing to his refusal to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, rather than because of the charges made against him.[1] He does not appear to have been further prosecuted.

Before proceeding further with our account of the Quakers, it seems appropriate at this point to determine, if possible, what other dissenting sects were at that time represented in Virginia. The act mentioned above against those who refused to have their children baptized, leads some to suppose that there were a few Baptists in the Colony.[2] The act, however, is not conclusive proof of this. The Quakers, in the

[1] Hening, II, 198. [2] Cooke, "Hist. of Va.", p. 221.
Neill, "Virginia Carolorum", p. 293.

general condemnation of all forms and ceremonies, including infant baptism. At a time when the memory of the excesses of the Anabaptists in Germany was still alive, this tenet would be particularly noticed and stamped as dangerous. But it probably had not yet become known to the assembly simply as one of the regular Quaker opinions; for it has been seen that John Porter was accused, not only of being well-affected toward the Quakers, but also of being so far "an anabaptist as to be against the baptising of Children". Hence a special act was aimed against persons holding this view.

In Beverley's "History of Virginia", the first edition of which appeared in 1705,

an account is given of an obscure conspiracy formed in 1663 by certain servants and others to overturn the government. The ring-leaders were, ~~according to Beverly,~~[1] "Oliverian" soldiers, who had been sent over to Virginia for misconduct at home; but the servants were, according to Beverly, also implicated. The plot was disclosed by Birkenhead, one of the conspirators, and came to nought. Birkenhead was rewarded by the General Assembly with his freedom and five thousand pounds in tobacco; and the 13th of September, the day on which the plot was to have been executed, was set apart for a yearly thanksgiving. This action of the Assembly is found recorded in the statutes of the Colony.[1] But Beverly

[1] Hening, II. 204.

is our authority for the particulars of the plot. Beverley wrote forty years after the event described — ample time for the growth of tradition — and it is not certain that he used authentic records in preparing his account.[1] His point of view, too, was that of a churchman disposed to believe all things discreditable to the Dissenters. For these reasons, his account of the affair is hardly to be fully accepted. The conspirators were probably of the convict class alone.

[1] Beverley says that Birkenhead was given two hundred pounds sterling; Hening puts the reward at five thousand pounds of tobacco. It is not possible to say which is correct; for Hening gives only an abstract of the order of the House of Burgesses, and the accuracy of the abstract cannot, of course, be vouched for.

It is concluded from the considerations and from the absence of definite statements in regard to them, given above, that at this time there were, in addition to the preliminary check, if any, Quakers in the Colony. The laws, however, were passed in a comprehensive manner to provide against Quakers in the Colony at the time, and against any who might come in in the future.

From the few authentic sources of information that remain, it may be gained that the laws against Quakers were unequally executed in different parts of the Colony, but that in no section were they thoroughly put in force for any length of time.

The spirit displayed toward Quakers by leading men in some sections may be seen in the report of Colonel Edmund Scarborough, written in 1663,

gives an account of the manner in which he had executed an order of the Assembly to collect rents and dues on the territory on the Eastern Shore which was at that time in dispute between Maryland and Virginia. Col. Scarborough met with several of the sect in this region, and their epithets of contempt are amusing. [illegible] one he called "the protector of [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible]"; another is described as a "cursing Quaker", a third, as a "factor of [illegible]".

The records of the county court of Accomac, among the very few such records of an early date that have been preserved, show that the first few Quakers who made their appearance in that

1 [illegible]

county were charged with vilifying the ministers, disobeying the laws, and blaspheming God. They were ordered to be sent to appear before the General Court. What further was done in the matter is not recorded.[1] Newbury, however, was not thus freed from Quakers; and it seems that as they became better understood they were allowed a greater degree of toleration. There were members of the society living in the county unmolested and respected between the years 1650 and 1690. The records say: "Thomas Brown and his wife, though Quakers, were yet of such known integrity that their affirmation was received instead of an oath."

The experience of the Quakers [illegible]

in Newbury [illegible]

[1] Records of Quarterly Courts, I p. [illegible]

[illegible] there experience in most of the older counties of the Colony. After the first few years of opposition on the part of the people at large in regard to the real tenets of the Quakers, and the first few years of turbulent and uninstructed zeal in the part of the [illegible] members of the society, it is probable that they were not, as a general rule, further molested, beyond being made to pay tithes and an occasional fine for non-attendance at church.

Of the turbulence and ignorance of many of the early Quakers we may judge from the records of the county courts of Accomac above referred to, although of course allowance must be made for the source; and also from what might be naturally expected of

of a new sect in a new country.
But the same thing may be inferred
even from Quaker writings.

Janney tells us that the Virginia
Friends led astray by John Perrot, were
visited and many of them reclaimed,
by John Burnyeat in 1666. But they
seem to have relapsed, for William
Edmundson reports in 1672 that
"things are much out of order as
regards church discipline." Church
discipline was found to be greatly
needed among them by George Fox also,
in his visit in 1672. William Ed-
mundson came to Virginia again in
1676; and on this visit too he found
many "loosely minded" among the Friends
there.[1]

[1] History of Friends [illegible] Vol. II. 287

It may be stated at once that Sir William Berkeley would hardly have dared to disregard entirely his instructions from the crown in reference to dissenters. The several Quaker missionaries mentioned in the preceding paragraph do not appear to have been molested by him. William Edmundson, indeed, had an interview with the governor in 1672 in regard to the sufferings of the Quakers. But in his journal Edmundson does not give illustrations of what these sufferings were, which, it seems reasonable to suppose he would have done, if they had been extreme. Edmundson himself, although he was treated with small courtesy by the governor, was not interfered with in his visits in his work in the colony. As many

conclude from this that the law of 1663 had by this time (1692) become practically, almost obsolete, so far as its extreme provisions were concerned. This amelioration of the condition of the Quakers was accelerated by the coming of Lord Culpeper to Virginia as governor in 1680. Lord Culpeper seems to have been much more inclined to carry out his instructions from the crown in regard to Dissenters than Sir William Berkeley had been. His instructions directed him "to permit a liberty of conscience to all other persons, except Papists, so they be contented with a quiet peaceable enjoying of it, not giving offence or scandal to the government.[1]" He has accordingly, very soon after his arrival, stopped execution against

[1] [illegible] Virginia [illegible], p. [illegible]

John Pleasants, who had been indicted in Henrico County under the old laws.

But for a very long time after their first appearance in the Colony, the Quakers were numerically strong in only one section of Virginia. This was the south-eastern section, the old stronghold of the Puritans. It seems that the Puritans remaining in Nansemond and adjacent counties were strong enough to determine the spirit in which the laws against the Quakers should be executed in ~~that~~ portion of the Colony. They, no doubt, cherished a good deal of antagonism toward Sir Wm Berkeley and his Royalist General Assembly, and would not be loath to show their feeling by obstructing the execution of laws of a special

character. Their congregations, too, had been broken up; and, in preference to worshipping at the parish churches, many of them, no doubt, cast in their lot with the Quakers.[1] Thus the Quakers found in the south-eastern section conditions more favorable to their protection and increase than they found in any other part of the Colony.

---

[1] It is known that Richard Bennett did this. Richard Bennett, former elder of the Nansemond congregation, one of the commissioners of Parliament in 1652 for the reduction of Virginia, and first governor of Virginia under the Provisional Government, continued to be a man of great influence even after the return of the Royalist party to power. In 1672, at the time of [illegible]

In 1689 the famous Toleration Act was passed by the English Parliament as a reward to the Protestant Dissenters for the part taken by them in the Revolution of 1688. Persons taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and subscribing a declaration against transubstantiation, were to be allowed to worship in their own meeting-houses,

principles, he was major-general of the forces of one of the military divisions into which the Colony was divided (See Calendar of State Papers [English] – Colonial (1661-1668), p. 401.) It will be remembered also that John Porter, the burgess expelled from the House in 1663, was from Lower Norfolk, one of the counties of the south-eastern section

provided these houses were legally registered. Dissenting ministers were to be licensed to preach and administer the sacraments in these meeting-houses, on condition that they took the oaths and signed the Thirty-nine Articles, with the exception of the 34th, 35th, 36th, and a part of the 20th. The articles excepted are those which refer to the constitution, forms, ceremonies, and claims of the National Church. For Baptists, further exception was made of article XXVII, which relates to infant baptism. Quakers were to be allowed to make declaration of fidelity toward the government, instead of taking the regular oaths; and an adherence to the following declaration of faith: "I A.---B. profess

faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his Eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, one God blessed for evermore; and do acknowledge the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine inspiration.

The Toleration Act was incorporated by reference into the laws of Virginia in April, 1699. In an act for the suppression of various forms of evil, Protestant dissenters are excepted from penalties incurred by failure to attend exercises of worship held at the legally established churches. The exemption is given in the following sentence; "Provided always, that if any person or persons dissenting from the Church of England, being every way qualified according to one act of Parliament made in the first year of the reign of our sovereign lord the King that now is.

1 Statutes at Large (English), x.

and the late Queen Mary of blessed memory, entitled an act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of certain laws, shall resort and meet at any congregation or place of religious worship permitted and allowed by the said act of Parliament, once in two months, that then the said penalties and forfeitures imposed by the act for neglecting or refusing to resort to their parish church or chapel as aforesaid, shall not be taken to extend to such persons, anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding.

1 By act XXXI of the revised statutes promulgated by the General Assembly in [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] of Parliament [illegible] to be considered valid in the courts of [illegible] [illegible] place of the [illegible] [illegible]

1 Hening IX. [illegible]

was a recognition of the act of Parliament on the subject passed in 1696.

In regard to the [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] about the time of the recognition of the Toleration Act by the Assembly, we have the testimony of a writer whose name is not known but whose account of the Colony was written between 1696 and 1698.[2] He says, "There [illegible] p. 298. The reference in the act to Roman Catholics illustrates the feeling of the time toward that class. It is enacted" "that Popish recusants convict, negroes, and mulattoes, and Indian servants and others not being Christians, shall be deemed and taken to be persons incapable in law to be witnesses in any cases whatsoever."

[2] Massachusetts Hist. Soc. Coll." 1st Series, V. 124, etc.

Page 70 (Middle of page)

Here in the first insertion

The Presbyterian meeting here referred to was probably the first set up in Virginia; for though the Rev. Francis Doughty, a Presbyterian minister who labored among the Puritans in Maryland for some years (beginning, probably, with the year 1657), preached occasionally in Virginia also, he did not gather together a congregation there. The Presbyterians of the ~~above~~ quotation given above were located on the Elizabeth River, and were, in the most of them, probably emigrants from the north of Ireland.

1 Briggs, American Presbyterianism, pp. 101, 111.

[illegible] twenty, not so many of any sort as to set up a meeting-house, except those of four meetings of Quakers, and one of Presbyterians." The situation of these meeting is not given; but it is almost certain that they were all, with the probable exception of one Quaker meeting in Henrico County[1], in the south-eastern section of the Colony.

This is the first mention [illegible] of Presbyterians in Virginia. The congregation was located on Elizabeth River.[2] The exact date of its origin cannot be determined, but its probable date is about 1690. At that time the Toleration Act had been passed in England; and although this act did not formally become a law

[1] Narr. & Crit. Hist. of America, III. 166

[2] Campbell, Hist. of Virginia, [illegible]

of Virginia till 1699, it is probable that as soon as it was passed in England, the old persecuting Virginia laws of 1663 became practically inoperative. This would be especially true for the south-eastern section, where, as we have seen, the cases against Dissenters had never been strictly [illegible].

The first certificate of qualification of Presbyterian dissenting minister in Virginia under the Toleration Act was issued Oct. 15, 1699, by the county court of Accomac to the Reverend Francis Makemie. Makemie is the first minister of that denomination known to have come to Virginia. Before taking up his residence in Virginia, he did duty on the eastern shore of Maryland, and organized several congregations there. Until 1699,

when the Church of England was established [illegible] been engaged by the inhabitants of that colony, Congregations could be gathered together without hindrance. Makemie settled in Accomac County, Virginia, sometime before the year 1690, and successfully engaged in business as a merchant. But his ministerial labors did not cease. As occasion offered, he preached in both Maryland and Virginia. When in 1699 he obtained from the county court of Accomac his certificate of qualification to preach, he had his dwelling-house at Pocomoke and the house at Onancock registered as places for holding service. His relations to the Presbyterian congregation on Elizabeth River cannot now be determined; but there must have been some connection

for it is shown by his will that he owned property in that neighborhood. In 1705 or 1706 Makemie was one of the ministers who united to form the Presbytery of Philadelphia, the first presbytery of the Presbyterian church in America. In 1707 Makemie, in company with Mr. John Hampton, paid a visit to New England. On their way thither they stopped in New York, and were imprisoned and fined for preaching without permission. A pamphlet, written by Makemie himself or under his supervision, gives an account of these proceedings.[1] Makemie died in 1708.[2] At his death the congregation collected by him in Virginia ceased to exist.

1 Force's Tracts, III. Foote's "Sketches of Virginia," ch. III.

2 Fiske, pp. 44 ff. Campbell's "Hist. of Virginia" p. [illegible]. Mr. Justin Winsor in the "Narrative [illegible]

ist. The Elizabeth River congregation was
served for years thereafter not very long
afterward.

It may be seen from the fore-
going that the recognition of the principle
of toleration by the General Assembly in
"Critical History of America", vol. V. chap. IV,
was fallen into a curious error in regard
to the early Presbyterians of Virginia, and
Makemie's connection with them. He says:
"The Governor [Gooch] [illegible]
became a favorite of the people. He granted
toleration to the Presbyterians, who were then
increasing on the frontiers, where Makemie
and the Scotch-Irish were beginning to gain
influence [illegible]
of the country beyond the mountains."

Again: "The dissenting element was
chiefly among the Presbyterians, and the ...

Virginia had no great immediate effect in increasing the number of dissenting congregations. On the contrary, after a few years, their number seems rather to have diminished. From the first edition of Beverley's[1] "History and Present State of Virginia" it is learned that there were in the Colony at the time when he wrote [illegible] and strongholds were away from the tidewater among the mountains. The Reverend Francis Makemie was the principal leader among them.

The more facts in reference to Makemie have been given above. Makemie lived on the Eastern Shore of Virginia, was licensed to preach in 1699, and died in 1708. The Presbyterians of the mountains did not begin to come into the Valley until 17[illegible].

[1] Published in 1705.

[illegible]

them he says:[1] "'Tis observed that those counties where the Presbyterian meetings are, [illegible] that reason can't get an orthodox minister to stay amongst them; but whenever they could, the people very orderly went to church. As for the Quakers, 'tis observed by letting them alone they decrease daily."

[illegible] the quality of the tobacco grown on the Eastern Shore and in the south-eastern section of the Colony is undoubtedly correct; and the dearth of ministers of the Established Church must certainly have made it less difficult for dissenters to gain proselytes. Beverley, before his death in 1716, revised his work, and in the

[illegible]

[1] Quoted in Foote's "Sketches, etc."

as follows: "But liberty of conscience is given to all other congregations pretending to Christianity, on condition they submit to all parish duties. They have but one sect conventicle among them, viz: a meeting of Quakers in Nansemond, others that have lately been being now extinct; and this observed by letting them alone they decrease daily." Nothing more is heard of Presbyterians in Virginia till the settling of the Shenandoah Valley in 1732.

In 1711 the Quakers of Virginia came into conflict with Governor Spotswood [illegible] that there was no [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] refused to assist the Colony in taking a position of defence. In a letter to Lord Dartmouth he describes the attitude of

1 "Hist. & Present State of Virginia" [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
"They decline," he says," not only refused to work themselves, or suffer any of their servants to be employed in the fortifications, but affirm that their consciences will not permit them to contribute in any manner or way to the defence of the country, even so much as furnishing the government with provisions to support them that do work; though at the same time they say that, being obliged by their religion to feed their enemies, if the French should come here and want provisions, they would, out of mere charity, supply them." Nevertheless, they are commanders-in-chief of the forces of the Colony and alone empowered to demand service of aid in times of emergency, and

[illegible]

as he very justly observes, "anyone that is lazy or cowardly may make use of the scruples of conscience to excuse himself from working or fighting when there is great need of his service." However, the French scare soon passed over, and with it, probably, the [illegible] [illegible]

According to Beverley, as has been noticed above, the Quakers had about the year 1716 but one meeting in Virginia. [illegible] after this they became more flourishing, as are shown by their own records and by a letter from the Rev. Mr. Forbes, minister in the upper parish of Isle of Wight County, to the bishop of London. In the year 1727 Samuel Bownas, a min-

[1] [illegible]

ministry of the [illegible], came to [illegible] on a second visit. His first visit had been made twenty-two years before. He states in his journal that in this time seven public meeting-houses had been built. The letter of the Rev. Mr. Ross, sent in 1724, corroborates in a general way this statement, and gives reasons for the increase.

"[illegible]: In [illegible] county, a large, populous, and wealthy county, the Quakers do sensibly increase, not only in offspring, but also proselytes; and so many are the offended persons there, [illegible] at the ministry of the Church, that there wants but little more than a learned, [illegible], and subtle Quaker-preacher to persuade a great many of them to Quakerism.[2]" [illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 Perry's "Hist. Collection relating to the American Colonial Church," I. [illegible].

person in Townsend? that one of their teachers was openly in the form of the [illegible], the episcopal ministry of the Church. It is not [illegible] that the [illegible] in any way furnished for it.

[illegible] that the [illegible] of the [illegible] were [illegible] in the [illegible] of the Colony. To the north of James River, the parishes were more regularly supplied with ministers, [illegible] the tobacco was better, probably with better [illegible]

Perry, p. 333 ff.

Mr. Forbes's letter is interesting also in that it contains the first undoubtedly authentic reference to Baptists in Virginia. The Baptist, however, did not attain to a position of any importance for many years after this.

ministers. At the same time, the case for the enforcement of church duties upon all men still, as had been the case [illegible] strictly enforced. Evidence of this is found in the case of Robert Jordan, who was imprisoned in 1720, and again in 1724, in Elizabeth City county for obstinate refusal to pay tithes and disrespectful language to the court when sued.[1]

[1] [illegible], XIII, [illegible]

XII

The Huguenots and the Germans.

Leaving the regular dissenters for a time, it becomes necessary to describe briefly a class of Virginia's population, which, occupying a somewhat anomalous position, may be said to form a connecting link between these dissenters and the Established Church. This class was made up of the Huguenots of Manakin Town and the less important Germans of Germanna. Certain principles were involved in the treatment of these settlements by the authorities of the government which make them of importance in this study because of their later extension to the western dissenters.

It was after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the Huguenots began to escape from France to all the Protestant countries of Europe, their desirability as colonists for the Plantations was quickly recognized by the English government. It was also appreciated by influential men in the Colonies. Thus in 1698, when the Lords of the Council of Trade and Plantations were engaged in making preparations for sending a large company of them to America, Colonel William Byrd submitted to that body a paper giving reasons why Virginia should be selected as their destination.[1] His arguments were convincing, and in the year 1700 about five hundred of these [illegible] [illegible] in the Colony.

[1] [illegible]

R. A. Brock in his introduction to "Huguenot Emigration to Virginia", page 9, says; "They appear to have settled at different points, a portion [illegible], some in Norfolk county, others in Surry, and [illegible]× [illegible], on the south side of James River (now in Powhatan county), where ten thousand acres of land, which had been occupied by the extinct Manakin tribe of Indians, [illegible] given them".

The settlement at Manakin Town was an especial care to the colonial government. In December, 1700, in order to encourage the refugees "to settle and remain together as near as may be to the said Manakin Town", an act was passed by the Assembly,

[illegible] seven years. This act made the refugees practically independent in church affairs. They made their own arrangements with ministers, and French was at first used in the services. The services were, however, probably those of the Church of England.[1] The Huguenot church was in fact looked upon as a part of the regular Establishment. Then, not long after the creation of the parish, its inhabitants met, according to the law of Va, and chose vestrymen, who, although they were called "elders", seem to have performed the duties of their office just as did the vestrymen of other parishes.[2]

---

[1] Meade, I. p. 466. [2] Cf. the Answer of Abraham Salle to the Petition of Mr. Philipe (Huguenot Emigration [illegible]

The policy of the colonial government in settling the Huguenots at Manakin Town is clearly set forth in a communication [dated [illegible]] from Governor Nicholson to the Lords of Trade. The communication states: "There is a great deal of good land and unpatented, where they may at present be all together, which we thought would be best for His Majesty's service and interests, and that they would be a <u>strengthening</u> to the frontiers, and would quickly make a settlement, not only for themselves, but to receive others whom His Majesty should be graciously pleased to send over."

The conflicts of the early colonists of Virginia with the Indians are well known. The Indian massacres of <u>1622 & 1644</u> are <u>landmarks in Virginia</u> [illegible]

colonial history. The statute book is full of legislation in regard to frontier forts, rangers, and other means of defence. The opposition of Sir William Berkeley to carrying on war with the Indians was one of the causes of Bacon's rebellion in 1676. Bacon, in his campaign against the Indians, had destroyed this very band of Monacans; but so great was the fear of Indians still remaining in the vicinity that the [illegible] [illegible] the time of the coming of the Huguenots, twenty-four years later. In the settlement of the valley of the [illegible], [illegible] the falls of the river, where Richmond now stands. Accordingly, while doing everything in its power to advance the

interests of the refugees, the government was not disposed to let slip such an opportunity for establishing their brethren in the wilderness on the frontiers of the Colony.

The same principle was involved in the settlement of the Germans at Germanna by Governor Spotswood in 1714. The frontiers continued to be subject at different points to Indian incursions, and Governor [illegible] had pursued the design of making certain tributary tribes as a means of defence. [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], and failed to take the position [illegible] them, [illegible] at the time the Germans came to Virginia. Governor Spotswood in a letter of July 21, 1714, to the Lords Commissioners of Trade, says

[illegible] furnish" a continual [illegible], to [illegible] our tributary Indians are [illegible] [illegible] supply that post, which was to have been covered by the Tuscaroras, I have placed here a number of Protestant Germans, built them a fort, and finished [furnished?] it with two pieces of cannon and some ammunition, which will awe the straggling parties of northern Indians, and be a good barrier for all that part of the country."

This party of Germans had been induced to come over to Virginia by the Baron de Graffenreidt, who had obtained an order from Queen Anne to the governor of Virginia that they be furnished with land on their arrival. They were skillful in [illegible] operations,

[illegible]

and it was hoped that ore might be found in Virginia. Since the prospector, however, has been unsuccessful in his undertakings, and had left Germany before the coming of the party, they were thus left entirely at the disposal of the Government of Virginia, and were settled on the frontier on the Rappahannock river, some distance above where Fredericksburg now stands. An act to exempt them from levies was passed, and they were taken under the special protection of the governor and several other gentlemen, who were interested in the development of Virginia's resources.[1] In February, 1716, their number altogether — men, women and children — was only about forty.[2]

[illegible]

[1] Spotswood's Letters, II. 75; [illegible] II. 255.
[2] Meade, II. 73.

In spite of the Germans had been accompanied by their own minister, but, for their majority, a petition was addressed in 1720 to the "Venerable Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts", asking its aid in securing means with which to pay the salary of a younger minister and to build a church. It was proposed that the young minister should be ordained in England, and that he should bring over with him for use in public worship the liturgy of the Church of England, translated into German.[1] What success the petition met with is not known. It shows, however, the willingness of the German settlers to become a part of the Established Church of Virginia, [illegible]

[1] The petition was given in [illegible]

as the French at Manakin Town had become a part of it.

The professed conformation of the Germans with the Church of Virginia was not a demand made upon them by the government. The government was willing to allow them to worship as they pleased. It was a step proposed by the Germans themselves because of the benefits that would arise from it. The same is true in the case of the French. There is no evidence that any demand was made upon them that they should conform themselves to the Establishment. It was, however, clearly to their interests to do so; and they could in this way show their desire to become thoroughly identified with the people among whom their lot was cast

Although, as it appears from the foregoing, the Huguenots, soon after their arrival in Virginia, identified themselves with the Established Church, and the Germans at least declared their willingness to do so; it must be remembered that both parties were at first, so far as the Church of Virginia was concerned, Dissenters. The government, in receiving them and settling them upon the frontier, set precedents which were soon followed in the case of other Dissenters.

XV

The Churches.

[illegible]

[illegible] Virginia in 1727, the settlement, the situation was exceedingly [illegible]. [illegible] and measures to these [illegible] the [illegible] of the settlement. The [illegible] was to grant [illegible] [illegible] settlers [illegible]

In 1732 the first [illegible] settlement in the [illegible] Virginia was made under one of these grants by Joist Hite and sixteen families from Pennsylvania [illegible] [illegible] The first settlers [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. They came [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Virginia [illegible] North Carolina. [illegible] prisoners [illegible] Campbell [illegible]

[1] [illegible] p. 373. [illegible]

[2] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] used in [illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] then, [illegible] through [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] having no licensed preacher and [illegible]

[illegible] manner of worship, [illegible]

[illegible] from the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] against them! But the [illegible]

[illegible] did not proceed to [illegible]

[illegible] the time of the [illegible] occasioned by

the [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible] had not obtained a licence [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

of Philadelphia [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible], the [illegible]

[illegible] on the [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible] difference to the matter. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 20 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] and instructive [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] and [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] in church and state, [illegible]

[illegible] missionaries [illegible] proper testimo[illegible], [illegible] with the [illegible], [illegible] in some certain [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] "deserted" [illegible]

[illegible] house, on the 7th, 8th, and 9th of January, [illegible]." [illegible] Mr. Croan [illegible], however, upon the meeting of the General Court returned to Pennsylvania. The cases were continued [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] England [illegible]

[illegible] throughout [illegible]."[1]

[illegible]

[1] [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] the

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] instruction [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible].[2] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]

---

[1] A letter written in 1707 by [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] than the instructions [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] (page) [illegible]

[2] [illegible], p. 866.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (the [illegible]), the [illegible], [illegible] now [illegible] to [illegible], the Church had [illegible]. [illegible] letter to [illegible] the [illegible], [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible];

Up till [illegible] have heard nothing. [illegible] to set you right on one thing, and to tell you that [illegible] neither [illegible]. [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible]; and [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] the [illegible].[1]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

the care of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] settled [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ministers to preach in any other county than the one for which he was licensed. Mr. Duncan answered [illegible] in [illegible] to the [illegible] that there [illegible] in the county [illegible] a settled min- [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] and the question of their rights had been thoroughly discussed.[1] [illegible] the ministers of the Church, [illegible] the Establishment. [illegible] ministers and [illegible]

[1] [illegible] discussed, in the [illegible] [illegible] p. 356.)

[illegible] that during the [illegible] and [illegible] that [illegible]
[illegible] of the struggle between the [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible], I think, the German Baptist [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] the spirit in which the [illegible]
and [illegible]
[illegible] the German [illegible]
[illegible]

1 Many of the early Separate Baptist ministers
who preached in Virginia [illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] and many of them were
imprisoned under [illegible] warrants. [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

in 1699, the [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

in the [illegible] in 17[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

in 17[illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]

The practice [illegible] in the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] in 17[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the present paper [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ... [illegible]

[illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible]

taine, [illegible] consistently [illegible]

[illegible] and some distinct [illegible]

[illegible] and [illegible], [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible], the [illegible]

[illegible]

on the [illegible], the [illegible]

[illegible] was that they [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

and the [illegible], [illegible]

with [illegible], and [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

independently, of those struggles in the scenes of the Commonwealth, they were, already, [illegible]

Under these circumstances, the Committee have to [illegible] the [illegible] over [illegible] [illegible], medicines, [illegible], in the [illegible] attention still fell upon the aim of the Union Board, which continued to receive to itself consideration of all matters and have to consider. The Committee had [illegible] [illegible] which to lend assistance in each locality [illegible] tion of the war was finished.

[illegible]

the day of complete [illegible] [illegible], the struggle was over. [illegible] was [illegible] was ended.

Bibliography

The followingy is a list of authorities and seurces referred:-

Beverley, Robert. — The History of Virginia. Richmond, 1855.

Burke, John. — The History of Virginia. Petersburg, 1805.

Campbell, Charles. — History of the Colony, and Ancient Dominion of Virginia. Philadelphia, 1860.

Cooke, John Esten, — Virginia, A History of Virginia. Boston, 1884.

Foote, William Henry. — Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical. Philadelphia, 1850

Force, Peter. — Tracts and other papers relating to the origin, settlement, and progress of the colonies in North America, from the discovery of the country to the year 1776. Washington, 1836-'46.

Greene, Jno. Richard. — History of the English People. New York, 1878-80.

Hawks, Francis L. — Contribution to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America. Vol. I. Virginia. New York 1836.

Semple, Robert B. *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia.* Richmond, 1810.

Janney, Samuel M. *History of the Religious Society of Friends, from its rise to the year 1828.* Philadelphia, 1867.

Jones, Hugh. *The Present State of Virginia.* New York, 1865.

Kercheval, Samuel. *A History of the Valley of Virginia.* Winchester, 1833.

Bishop Meade. *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia.* Philadelphia, 1860.

Neill, Edward D. *History of the Virginia Company of London.* Albany, 1869.

" *Virginia Carolorum* " Albany, 1886.

Peyton, J. Lewis. *History of Augusta County, Virginia.* Staunton, Virginia, 1882.

Randall, Daniel R. *A Puritan Colony in Maryland. In the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.* Baltimore 1886.

Semple, Robert B. A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia. Richmond, 1810.

Tracey, Joseph. " The Great Awakening ".
Boston 1841,

Winsor, Justin. Narrative and Critical History of America." Boston& New York, 1889.

Calendar of State Papers. Colonial(1661-1668). London 1889.

Historical Collections relating to the American Colonial Church.
Hartford . 1870- 78. Ed. by William Stevens Perry, D.D.

Massachusetts Historical Collections. Boston 1806- 57.
(1st Series . Vol. V.).

Statutes at Large, English. London. 1831.

Statutes at Large (of Virginia). New York 1823.
Edited by William Walter Henning.

Virginia Historical Collection
Richmond 1882- 1891.

Bibliography.

The following is a list of authors [illegible] [illegible] referred to:—

Beverley, Robert. The History of Virginia. Richmond, 1855.

Burk, John. The History of Virginia. Petersburg, 1805.

Campbell, Charles. History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia. Philadelphia 1860.

Cooke, John Esten. Virginia, a History of Virginia. Boston. 1884.

[illegible] [illegible] Virginia and [illegible] [illegible] 1888.

Force, Peter. Tracts and other papers relating principally to the origin, settlement, and progress of the colonies in North America from the discovery of the country to the year 1776. Washington. 1836-46.

Green, John Richard. History of the English People. New York. 1878-80.

Hawks, Francis L. Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America. Vol. I. Virginia. New York. 1836.

Janney, Samuel M. History of the Religious Society of Friends from its rise to the year 1828. Philadelphia. 1859.

Jones, Hugh. The Present State of Virginia. New York. 1865.

Kercheval, Samuel. A History of the Valley of Virginia. Winchester, 1833.

Bishop Meade. Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia. Philada. 18[illegible]

Neill, Edward D. History of the Virginia Company of London. Albany, 1869.

Virginia Carolorum. Albany, 1886.

[illegible], [illegible]. History of [illegible] of Virginia. [illegible]

Randall, Daniel R. A Puritan Colony in Maryland. In the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Baltimore, 1886.

[illegible] A History of the rise and progress of the [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible]

Tracy, Joseph. The Great Awakening. Boston. 1841.

Winsor, Justin. "Narrative and Critical History of America". Boston [illegible]

Calendar of State Papers — Colonial (1661-1668). London. 1880.

Historical collections relating to the American colonial church. Hartford. 1870-78. Ed. by William Stevens Perry. [illegible]

[illegible] Historical Collections [illegible] (1st Series, vol. 1).

Statutes at Large (English) continued with

Statutes at Large (Virginia). Hening

Edited by William Waller Hening.

[illegible]

Richmond, 1823–?

Biographical Note.

The writer, Henry Read McIlwaine, was born in the village of Farmville, Prince Edward County, Virginia, July 12, 1864. He was prepared for college at the Petersburg "University School," of which Captain W. Gordon McCabe is head master. He entered in 1883 the junior class at Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia, and at the end of two sessions was graduated with the degree of A.B. After leaving college, he taught school for four years — two years as principal of the "[illegible] school" in Greenbrier County, West Virginia, and two years as principal of the "Liberty Hall School" in Tazewell County, Virginia.

In the Fall of 1889, he entered the Johns Hopkins University, where he has since continued with the exception of the session of 1891-92. This session he held the position of assistant in the University School of Montgomery, Alabama. While at the Johns Hopkins University he has studied principally History, English and Political Economy, under Doctors Adams, Bright, Ely, Browne, and Emmott. To these gentlemen he is much indebted for their uniform courtesy and kindness in personal relations, and for a quickening of his interest in all those things that make for real culture.